## Case 1:11-cr-00666-LAP Document 34 Filed 06/05/14 Page 1 of 24 1

ESKUMONS			
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK			
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,			
V.	11 CR 666 (LAP)		
HECTOR XAVIER MONSEGUR,			
Defendant.			
x			
	New York, N.Y. May 27, 2014		
	11:00 A.M.		
Before:			
HON. LORETTA	A. PRESKA,		
	District Judge		
	Discrice oddge		
APPEARA	NCES		
PREET BHARARA  United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York  JAMES J. PASTORE, JR. Assistant United States Attorney			
		FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK	
		PHILIP WEINSTEIN	
Attorneys for Defendant			
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		

1	(In the ceremonial courtroom)
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
3	THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Won't
4	you be seated.
5	United States v. Hector Monsegur.
6	Government ready?
7	MR. PASTORE: We are, your Honor, good morning.
8	Jim Pastore for the United States. Joining me at
9	counsel table is Ilhwan Yum, of the FBI.
10	THE COURT: Good morning.
11	MR. YUM: Good morning.
12	THE COURT: Defense ready?
13	MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes, your Honor, Federal
14	Defenders of New York, by Peggy Cross-Goldenberg and Philip
15	Weinstein.
16	THE COURT: Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, have you and your
17	client had adequate time to review the presentence report?
18	MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes, your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Is there any reason it should not be made
20	part of the record?
21	MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Are there any objections to the
23	presentence report?
24	MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor.
25	THE COURT: Thank you.

With respect to the offense level computation, I accept the findings of the presentence report set forth at paragraphs 4 through 60, which conclude that a total offense level of 35 is appropriate.

I do note that in paragraph 49 the citation to the sentencing quidelines should be to Section 2B1.1(b)(1)(L).

With respect to the defendant's criminal history, I accept the findings of the presentence report set forth at paragraphs 61 through 66, which conclude that a criminal history category of one is appropriate.

Counsel, I have the defense sentencing memorandum dated May 23, 2014. And I have the government's sentencing memorandum dated May 23, 2014.

Are there any additional written materials I should be looking at?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor.

MR. PASTORE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well, then. Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, would you like to speak on behalf of the defendant?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you, your Honor.

It is our privilege to have the opportunity to speak on behalf of Mr. Monsegur this morning. We've never been witness to a case like this. Mr. Monsegur and the assistance that he provided, both, are truly extraordinary.

We agree with the recommendation of probation that a

sentence of time served is appropriate in this case.

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Monsegur viewed the internet as a tool that could be used to increase accountability and freedom.

During the Arab Spring, for example, when he learned that other countries were cutting off internet access, he did what he could to help restore access and circumvent restrictions so activists could stay connected.

He also hoped to use the internet to raise awareness of his fellow citizens, and to increase the accountability of the government and its contractors.

Of course, for all of the technical sophistication of their work, he and some of his internet cohorts demonstrated a level of immaturity exhibited by leaving behind some lighthearted calling cards letting system administrators know that they had been able to pass through a security opening in the system.

They did some things designed to get laughs, like posting an article on a news website about alleged current whereabouts of a very much alive rapper, Tupac Shakur.

And some of Mr. Monsegur's conduct was motivated by desperation. For example, in his struggle to support his two young cousins who were in his custody, he used account information that he had obtained on line to pay some household As with many types of cases covered by the United bills. States Sentencing Guidelines, Section 2B1.1, the guidelines

E5R0MONS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

here are not really a fair representation of the harm caused by Mr. Monsegur's activities. Yes, the value charged to strangers' accounts and damage that he did, without permission, should be fairly attributed to him. But much of the dollar amount in the loss calculations in the presentence report, as your Honor just referred to, includes money to fix security holes that Mr. Monsegur did not cause. He did not break the systems, he revealed vulnerabilities. These systems needed fixing anyway, regardless of his actions.

But, your Honor, I'm not here today to argue about the quidelines. And that is because on June 7, 2011, Mr. Monsegur made a whole-hearted commitment to making up for his conduct. From the moment agents knocked on his door, he put his family first. He knew that if he was detained following his arrest, his two young cousins would be taken from his custody and placed with strangers.

As the government's papers made clear, the timeliness of Mr. Monsegur's decision to cooperate was critical to the ultimate success of his cooperation. Before he discussed the pros and the cons and the costs and benefits of cooperation with an attorney, he fully committed to working with the agents who came to his home. And as the government submission details, the nature and extent of Mr. Monsegur's cooperation was great.

He reviewed footprints of past computer intrusions and

explained the steps that had been taken to agents. He reviewed chat logs, verifying his participation and placing different conversations in context. He resumed his on-line activities and passed along new information that he obtained.

He also confessed to conduct that the government was unaware of and, likely, never would have been able to prove.

This of course dramatically increased his sentencing exposure.

Because of his on-line name recognition, people wanted to work with him. When people around the world identified vulnerabilities, they passed them along to Mr. Monsegur, whether because they were bragging about their discoveries or because they wanted his stamp of approval.

Some of these vulnerabilities were simply open doors in computer systems that people intended to walk through for laughs. Because of Mr. Monsegur's work, these doors were able to be closed before anyone could walk through them.

But others were vulnerabilities that could have been, and in some instances were intended to be exploited with disastrous consequences. For example, individuals revealed to Mr. Monsegur that they had discovered a vulnerability in the water supply system of a major U.S. city that would have allowed for the disruption and contamination of that system.

Another example is the vulnerability that individuals revealed that would have permitted a takeover in the supply and distribution chain of a foreign energy supply company. The

disastrous consequences of these takeovers were avoided due to Mr. Monsegur's extraordinary assistance.

Indeed, as the government detailed in its submission, Mr. Monsegur helped avoid over 300 intrusions. In doing so he strengthened the security of agencies such as the United States Congress, the United States Courts, other government agencies, as well as private companies.

It is impossible to quantify the savings that resulted from his actions, but the government estimates that he helped save many millions, if not billions of dollars.

Mr. Monsegur did all of this, your Honor, at great cost and risk to him and his family. For months, he worked around the clock. Many of the people he interacted with on the internet were overseas. And the time differences required Mr. Monsegur to be on line at all hours of the night.

The government tracked everything he typed with a key logging program. There was a camera installed in his house to monitor all of his activities. For 9 months, he kept up this around-the-clock pace. He gave everything that he had. And then on March 6, 2012, the world became a much more dangerous place for him and his family. The government used the information he had provided to arrest LulzSec co-conspirators, as well as others, and then decided to publicize his cooperation to capitalize on the deterrent effect of announcing his cooperation.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Law enforcement decided that the deterrent value of announcing his cooperation was greater than the value of his continued proactive cooperation. As the Court knows, paperwork regarding cooperation usually is unsealed only on the eave of a trial at which testimony is required, or on the eave of the cooperator's own sentencing. And in many cases, because most cases are resolved with a guilty plea the cooperation is never publicly revealed and some sentencing proceedings and even some complete dockets remain under seal. This could have been such a case, because all of Mr. Monsegur's co-conspirators, all of the co-conspirators, pled quilty without a trial. But the government sought the added deterrent of making his cooperation public. It was not just the fact that his cooperation, it was the fact his cooperation was revealed. Law enforcement revealed details of his cooperation and his arrest that were known only to Mr. Monsegur and the agents.

The morning after his cooperation was revealed, his face and his story were plastered all over the internet. It was not even safe for him to go home. And Mr. Monsegur and some of his family had to be relocated. People in his neighborhood may not have known the details of this case.

Indeed most of those who were arrested were arrested overseas. But many had a strong objection to the concept of cooperation with law enforcement.

While the details of his work may not have trickled

down to the streets, the fact that he was a snitch certainly did. This, alone, exposed Mr. Monsegur and his family to danger. They were threatened in retaliation for his cooperation. His brother was physically assaulted.

The press was relentless. For example, a reporter followed his young cousins into their elementary school in clear violation of the school security policy to question them about Mr. Monsegur and the case. And it was not just that the publicity was unwelcome or embarrassing, it was really dangerous. One of Mr. Monsegur's former employers received a voicemail message threatening Mr. Monsegur. A magazine cover story detailing his family history and his cooperation was published. And while Mr. Monsegur was at the MCC, that story made the rounds within the institution. This exposed him to serious danger.

The publicity also threatened the girls. The morning after Mr. Monsegur's cooperation was publicly revealed, he received a phone call. And the agency that oversaw the girls foster care placement threatened to take them away from Mr. Monsegur and place them with strangers. It is impossible to put into words the terror, the fear that ran through the entire family as we all traveled together to the agency that morning to plead that the girls be permitted to remain with family.

Luckily, after hours of closed-door meetings, the agency agreed to accelerate the return of the girls to their

mother's custody. As the Court knows, Mr. Monsegur was detained at the MCC from May through December of 2012. Despite the attention and the danger generated by his cooperation, Mr. Monsegur attempted to make the most of his time at the MCC. He read. He planned. And he taught. He used his skills to help other incarcerated individuals. He designed a course on computing essentials. He knew that the job prospects for formerly-incarcerated individuals were bleak, especially when they didn't have up-to-date computer skills. So he designed a course to teach the very basics, as well as some simple system troubleshooting, and some simple software use.

Since his release in December of 2012, he's continued to focus on his family. He cares for sick family members and remains an important part of the girls' lives. But he despairs when he thinks of what he put his family through. When he thinks about their personal information being distributed on line, about the dangers that he placed them in, they and he will live with the consequences of his actions forever.

Through the great personal cost to Mr. Monsegur, though, came tremendous benefit to the government. By any measure, your Honor, whether it is dollars, time, energy, level of information, crisis averted, by any measure, Mr. Monsegur has more than made up for his actions.

By any measure of the factors contained in Title 18
United States Code 3553(a), no further period of incarceration

or supervision is necessary. In light of the nature and circumstances of his offense, his own personal history and characteristics, the severe punishment he already has faced, much of it not contemplated by the guidelines, and in light of his full compliance with the conditions of his release over the past 18 months, any further term of incarceration or supervision would be greater than necessary to effect the statutory sentencing objectives.

Because of his cooperation, there is no truly similarly-situated defendant to whom his sentence can be compared. But a sentence of time served would not create any unwarranted sentencing disparities. His LulzSec co-conspirators received sentences ranging from probation to 30 months incarceration. This Court provided over another affiliated case that resulted in a higher sentence, but the Court is aware that there were distinctions between the cases that warranted the disparity in sentences.

By any of the measures contained in the United States
Sentencing Guidelines Section 5K1.1, a sentence of time served
is the just and appropriate sentence. Mr. Monsegur's
cooperation was timely. It was significant. It was truthful.
It was extensive. And it was done at great risk of retaliation
and danger to him and his family.

In the presentence report, probation recognizes his valuable and significant assistance in recommending a sentence

of time served.

Your Honor, Mr. Monsegur's cooperation was extraordinary in every way. For all of these reasons, we respectfully request that the Court impose a sentence of time served.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I guess I should ask, before I ask Mr. Monsegur to speak, if the government now moves.

MR. PASTORE: Yes, your Honor. Most of what I have to say is in our submission. I do want to highlight a few points.

First, I agree with defense counsel. It is difficult to fully quantify Mr. Monsegur's cooperation, whether solely by the number of prosecutions, or by the number of hacks that he helped prevent.

At the time of his arrest, he was uniquely situated, really, to provided singular insight into anonymous LulzSec and other significant cyber criminals.

Through Monsegur's cooperation, law enforcement gained a better understanding of how those hacker collectives operated. Through Mr. Monsegur's cooperation, law enforcement, both domestically and abroad, was able to unmask and prosecute a number of significant cyber criminals. And through Mr. Monsegur's cooperation, we were able to thwart all together or mitigate harm from hundreds of hacks.

In terms of Mr. Monsegur's truthfulness, he provided information to the government about a number of activities that the government was not aware of and not investigating. And that did substantially increase his guidelines exposure, as opposed to a situation where he chose simply to plead guilty and not cooperate.

And, finally, I do want to emphasize the personal risk that Mr. Monsegur took, not only upon himself but on his family. Defense counsel has touched on some of those incidents. But it is difficult to capture the around-the-clock operation that this really was.

Mr. Monsegur would chat on line with individuals at the direction of law enforcement. And then he would meet with law enforcement afterwards to do a full debrief on exactly who each of those individuals were, what he knew about them, and how they fit into the overall picture of LulzSec and the other cyber crimes that he provided information about.

Through his cooperation, we averted untold millions of dollars in loss to victims. And we also averted potential really catastrophic problems with critical infrastructure. So for that reason, the government now moves, pursuant to Section 5K1.1 of the guidelines for a downward departure and also pursuant to Title 18 United States Code Section 3553(e) for relief from the mandatory minimum.

THE COURT: The government's motion is granted.

As the government sets out in its submission, Mr. Monsegur's cooperation was truly extraordinary.

As to the significance and usefulness of his assistance, the government characterizes his cooperation as extraordinarily valuable and productive.

The government notes that Mr. Monsegur provided,
"unprecedented access to LulzSec." As counsel pointed out, Mr.
Monsegur was singularly able to provide sophisticated and
complex assistance to the government.

His assistance allowed the government to pierce the secrecy surrounding the group, to identify and locate its core members and, successfully, to prosecute them.

As pointed out by counsel, Mr. Monsegur's assistance allowed the government to understand better the hacker cooperatives, to understand and analyze the footprints of prior computer intrusions, and as Ms. Cross-Goldenberg pointed out, to reveal to the government and, thus, close the doors to various, numerous, in fact, vulnerabilities that had been identified by the hacking community.

As Ms. Cross-Goldenberg pointed out, this averted compromise of the water supply of a major United States city, the takeover of a supply and distribution channel of a foreign energy company.

As the government and Ms. Cross-Goldenberg also point out, Mr. Monsegur's cooperation was truly extraordinary because

of the around-the-clock nature of it at the outset. As pointed out in the papers, the organization apparently had protocols in place that would require the destruction of certain information if members were off line for a certain period of time.

And the fact that Mr. Monsegur immediately chose to cooperate and went back on line, prevented the destruction of all of that material and allowed the extraordinary cooperation that the government details in its papers.

So in this instance, the immediacy of Mr. Monsegur's cooperation and its around-the-clock nature was particularly helpful to the government. As to the truthfulness, completeness, and reliability of Mr. Monsegur's cooperation, the government notes that he presented as, "fully candid and admitted not only to crimes about which the government had gathered evidence, but also crimes about which the government had not previously gathered evidence."

As noted by counsel, those admissions dramatically increased Mr. Monsegur's guidelines level. The government also evaluates Mr. Monsegur's cooperation as consistently reliable and complete, corroborated by documents and electronic files, as well as statements from other witnesses.

The government also notes that Mr. Monsegur has been cooperating with law enforcement for approximately three years, and notes that he provided substantial historical cooperation as well as substantial proactive cooperation, and was prepared

to testify as needed.

The government also notes, however, that with the exception of one individual, Mr. Monsegur's cooperation, "no doubt played a significant role in securing several of [the] guilty pleas," of related individuals.

Finally, as to the risk and danger associated with Mr. Monsegur's cooperation, I must say this is also an extraordinary case for that reason. As detailed by Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, it is quite unusual for the government to publicize cooperation and particularly at such an early stage. As Ms. Cross-Goldenberg pointed out, usually the cooperation is only disclosed prior to the trial of the co-defendant, or at the sentencing of the actual cooperating defendant, and sometimes not even then. But as contained in Ms. Cross-Goldenberg's papers, the government issued a lengthy press release at the time of the arrest of a number of the related defendants, trumpeting Mr. Monsegur's cooperation. He has quite graphically discussed the fall-out from that publicity.

But I note, first, that it is very, very unusual.

Secondly, I don't think there is any question that Mr. Monsegur and his family were subject to threats, assaults, and all manner of danger, to the extent that Mr. Monsegur and members of his family have been relocated.

Ms. Cross-Goldenberg has also related the danger of

the young girl cousins being removed to family protective services, and the extraordinary efforts she and her team went through to keep the girls with a family member. So I certainly take that into account.

And for all of these reasons, find that Mr. Monsegur's entitled to a downward departure.

Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, did you wish to add anything more before I ask Mr. Monsegur if he wishes to speak?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Sir, do you wish to speak?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Would you do so now, please?

Stand up, speak out. The mic will pick you up.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: The last three years, I have gone through a lot of changes, learned a lot of lessons. I came a long way -- yeah, I came a long way. I have had to do a lot of thinking and soul searching and evolving, psychologically, emotionally. One of the things I realized is that I hurt my family the most, my friends, and victims in the case. And I have gained such regret for even putting anyone through this. I assure you I will not be in this courtroom ever again. I -- I'm not the same person you saw three years ago. I'm ready to

move on.

That's it, thank you.

THE COURT: Yes, sir, thank you.

Does the government wish to be heard?

MR. PASTORE: No, your Honor. Nothing further.

THE COURT: Very well, then.

If there are any victims in the courtroom who would like to be heard, would you come forward, now.

Seeing none.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

Counsel, as you have heard, I have calculated the guidelines and certainly consider them in this sentencing. And as Ms. Cross-Goldenberg pointed out, the crimes which Mr.

Monsegur confessed to, of which the government previously had no knowledge, contributed significantly to the increase in his guidelines sentencing level. But, nevertheless, I take that into account and find that the guidelines accurately describe the nature and circumstances of the offense.

In so doing, though, I do observe that the amount of the loss and damage is in great part attributable to the vulnerabilities that were present in the systems which were hacked. That doesn't excuse what was done, but I do make that observation.

With respect to the history and characteristics of the defendant, of course Mr. Monsegur is in criminal history

category I, the lowest category. But, as we've heard here today from counsel, that does not begin to describe the man who is being sentenced.

I do note, at the outset, Mr. Monsegur's extreme care for his young cousins. And this was throughout the time when their mother was absent, a time prior to his arrest, and described great devotion of Mr. Monsegur. That he was able to continue that high level of devotion at a time when he was under so much personal stress, is a great tribute to him. But the major driving force in this sentencing is of course the extraordinary cooperation which Mr. Monsegur provided.

As I have mentioned, the timeliness of his decision to cooperate was crucial in permitting the cooperation to thwart attacks that might take place and in permitting the government to identify and locate other co-conspirators. That he continued that cooperation for extraordinary time periods. And of course I don't rely merely on the three years, but on the virtual around-the-clock cooperation where Mr. Monsegur was sitting with agents, around the clock, to talk with hackers from around the world. It was truly extraordinary. We don't often hear of this.

Aside from the timeliness and the extent of Mr.

Monsegur's cooperation, the fact that he was able to lend his skills to the government in an effort to identify perpetrators and so very importantly to thwart attacks on American cities,

and energy distribution, various arms of the United States government, is truly extraordinary. So, to me, that personal characteristic of turning on a dime and doing good and not evil is the most important factor in this sentencing.

As among the paragraph two factors, the most important factors, in my view, are public deterrence and unwarranted sentencing disparities.

I certainly take to heart the thought that a lengthy sentence of incarceration would deter others. However, in this instance, in light of Mr. Monsegur's cooperation, which is truly extraordinary, a lengthy sentence is much more than what is required to fulfill the sentencing guidelines.

I do note that as set out in counsel's papers, other perpetrators in this scheme have received substantial sentences.

With respect to unwarranted sentencing disparities, in light of Mr. Monsegur's personal characteristics, particularly his extraordinary cooperation, any perceived sentencing disparity is, in my view, well warranted.

Taking all of those factors into account, then, counsel, it is my intention to sentence Mr. Monsegur to time served, followed by a period of one year of supervised release on each count, to run concurrently.

As I understand it, the Government is going to provide additional information on restitution; is that right?

1 MR. PASTORE: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: Within the 90 days. 2 3 MR. PASTORE: Yes, your Honor. 4 And as to forfeiture, we have not located any assets 5 of the defendant, so we're not seeking it at this time. 6 THE COURT: Very well, then. 7 And, finally, it is my intention to impose the mandator \$1200 special assessment. 8 9 Counsel, is there any reason such a sentence should 10 not be imposed? 11 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor. MR. PASTORE: No, your Honor. 12 13 THE COURT: Very well, then. 14 Mr. Monsegur, you're sentenced, sir, to a period of 15 time served, followed by a period of one year of supervised 16 release. 17 During that time, you have to comply with all of the standard terms and conditions of supervised release. Among 18 19 them are that you not commit another federal, state, or local 20 crime; you not illegally possess a controlled substance; and you not possess a firearm or other destructive device. 21 22 Counsel, I'm sorry, I neglected to say that it's my 23 intention to impose the recommended special conditions of 24 search, and consent to a computer monitoring program.

Is there any objection to that?

25

1 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor. MR. PASTORE: No, your Honor. 2 3 THE COURT: Very well, then. 4 Sir, during the period of supervised release, you will 5 submit your person, residence, place of business, vehicle, or 6 other premises under your control to a search on the ground 7 that the probation officer has reasonable belief that contraband or evidence of a violation of the terms and 8 9 conditions of your release may be found there. 10 The search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner. Failure to submit to such a search 11 12 might be grounds for revoking your supervised release. 13 It will be your obligation to inform other residents 14 of the premises that that premises may be subject to a search, 15 under this condition. As I mentioned, counsel will provide information 16 relating to restitution within 90 days. But at this point, I 17 must impose and do impose the \$1200 special assessment. And 18 19 that should be paid promptly. 20 It's my duty to inform you, sir, that unless you have 21 waived it, you have the right to appeal this sentence. And you 22 might have the right to appeal in forma pauperis, which means 23 as a poor person, with the waiver of certain fees and expenses. 24 Counsel, is there anything further? 25 MR. PASTORE: Yes, your Honor. At this time, the

government moves to dismiss the underlying indictments and open counts. And in particular, we move to dismiss the indictments in the related cases 11 CR 693, 694, 695, and 696.

THE COURT: So ordered.

Anything else, Ms. Cross-Goldenberg?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: It may not need to be addressed now until we finalize the restitution, but we would request that the restitution be ordered to be paid as a percentage of Mr. Monsegur's monthly income.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: We would request 10 percent. I don't know if we need to do that today or if we can handle that --

THE COURT: Why don't do you it in your letter with respect to restitution.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Monsegur, as we have heard -- that's all right, that doesn't hurt, he can stand. That was a very good thing to do.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes.

THE COURT: I take it as a sign of great respect. Thank you.

As we have heard, the things you did before were not so good. I do appreciate you're saying, and heartily believe, that we will not see you in this courtroom ever again. You

obviously have great skill. To deploy that skill for good, would be a very good thing. You have done as much as any human being can do in terms of helping the government to make up for your past wrongs and to avert other damage to probably millions

So I salute you for that. I salute you for your teaching at the MCC. You seem to be on the right path. And I look forward reading about your deploying your great skills for

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

Counsel, thank you for your assistance.

Good morning.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. PASTORE: Thank you your Honor.

22